

**PORTFOLIO HOLDER  
ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT  
DECISION NOTICE**

At the meeting of the Portfolio Holder – Energy and Environment, held on the 3<sup>rd</sup> April, 2017 the following matters were discussed. The decisions of the Portfolio Holder are set out below in each item along with reasons for the decision and other options considered.

**DNPH.EE.48 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interests in respect of items on the agenda.

**DNPH.EE.49 REVIEW OF THE THREE GATING ORDERS – FOR VARIOUS FOOTPATHS WITHIN AREAS 1,2 AND 3 FORMING THE EAST MARSH GATING SCHEME**

The Portfolio Holder considered a report that details the results of an annual review of the Gating order imposed on various footpaths located within the East Marsh Gating Scheme

**RESOLVED – That all three Gating Orders continue without any variation, until the next annual review.**

## REASONS FOR DECISION –

These Gating Orders are continuing to have a positive impact on the levels of crime and anti-social behaviour in the locality and of the feeling of wellbeing amongst the local residents. There have not been any objections to its continuation raised by local residents, Ward Councillors or the Police. They also continue to receive the support of the Shoreline Housing Partnership.

## OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED –

Revocation Of The Order - This option will require consultation and advertisement in the local press. We believe that objections are likely to be raised by the residents, which if unresolved, could result in a Public Inquiry.

Variation Of The Order - This option would also incur an on-going cost implication to manage the variation. The actual cost would depend on the complexity of the variation proposed but an estimation of this cost has previously been provided by our security section. The cost to manage the simplest of variations has been estimated at £2,600 per annum.

DNPH.EE.50

## **REVIEW OF GATING ORDER – FOOTPATH LINKING KINGSLEY GROVE AND FIRST AVENUE, GRIMSBY**

The Portfolio Holder considered a report that shows the results of an annual review of the Gating Order imposed on the footpath linking Kingsley Grove with First Avenue, Grimsby.

**RESOLVED – That the Gating Order imposed on the footpath linking Kingsley Grove with First Avenue, Grimsby be continued without any variation, until the next annual review.**

## REASONS FOR DECISION –

This Gating Order are continuing to have a positive impact on the levels of crime and anti-social behaviour in the locality and there have not been any objections to its continuation raised by local residents, Ward Councillors or the Police.

## OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED –

Revocation Of The Order -

This option will require consultation and advertisement in the local press. We believe that objections are likely to be raised by the residents, which if unresolved, could result in a Public Inquiry.

#### Variation Of The Order -

This option would also incur an on-going cost implication to manage the variation. The actual cost would depend on the complexity of the variation proposed but an estimation of this cost has previously been provided by our security section. The cost to manage the simplest of variations has been estimated at £2,600 per annum.

#### DNPH.EE.51 **REVIEW OF GATING ORDER – FOOTPATH LINKING ROMSEY COURT AND MAXWELL COURT, GRIMSBY.**

The Portfolio Holder considered a report that showed the results of an annual review of the Gating Order imposed on the footpath linking Romsey Court to Maxwell Court, Grimsby.

**RESOLVED – The Gating Order imposed on the footpath linking Romsey Court to Maxwell Court, Grimsby be continued without any variation, until the next annual review.**

#### REASONS FOR DECISION –

This Gating Order is continuing to have a positive impact on the levels of crime and anti-social behaviour in the locality and there have not been any objections to its continuation raised by local residents, Ward Councillors or the Police.

#### OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED –

##### Revocation Of The Order –

This option will require consultation and advertisement in the local press. We believe that objections are likely to be raised by the residents, which if unresolved, could result in a Public Inquiry.

##### Variation Of The Order –

This option would also incur an on-going cost implication to manage the variation. The actual cost would depend on the complexity of the variation proposed but an estimation of this cost has previously been provided by our security section. The cost to manage the simplest of variations has been estimated at £2,600 per annum.

#### DNPH.EE.52 **KINGS ROAD AND QUEENS ROAD, IMMINGHAM: TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER – HGV PROHIBITION OF WAITING**

The Portfolio Holder considered a report that introduces an overnight Prohibition of Waiting restriction for HGVs along Southern kerb line of

Queens Road, Immingham and at all times along the Western kerb line of Kings Road, Immingham,

**RESOLVED –**

- (1) That, subject to consultation and no objections being received, approval be granted to the making of a “Waiting Of Goods Vehicles Over 7.5T Maximum Gross Weight Prohibited” Traffic Regulation Order, on Kings Road to the extent shown in Appendix 1 on drawing TRF/16/4.0/HGV/03.**
- (2) That, subject to consultation and no objections being received, approval be granted to the making of a “Waiting Of Goods Vehicles Over 7.5T Maximum Gross Weight Prohibited” Traffic Regulation Order, on Queens Road to the extent shown in Appendix 2 on drawing TRF/16/IMM/HGV/06.**
- (3) That, in the event that there are unresolved objections to the Order, these are referred back to the Portfolio Holder for determination and a decision as to whether or not the Traffic Regulation Order be confirmed.**

**REASON FOR DECISION –**

To prevent the waiting of vehicles exceeding 7.5T (Maximum Gross Weight). This class of vehicle is considered unsuitable to wait in the proposed areas, given the existing character of the roads and adjoining properties.

To improve the air quality and reduce noise levels during unsociable hours for residents in Kings Road and Queens Road.

To reduce the potential for the leaving of litter and human waste believed to be caused by the parking of Heavy Goods Vehicles.

To preserve the condition of the surrounding footway and grass verges.

**OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED –**

Parking can be better regulated through the use of “HGV No Loading” restrictions. These would require additional road markings. Whilst recognised as effective and easily enforced, given the commercial nature of the areas concerned, such restrictions are more restrictive and may prevent any necessary loading activities. This is as a result of a continued requirement for the nearby business’ to load or offload deliveries in order to function effectively.

Should no action be taken, it is likely that the parking and movement of HGVs will continue to cause distress to the residents of Kings Road

and Queens Road. If left untreated the situation may worsen if more HGVs decide to park at this location in a bid to avoid Lorry Park Fees.

DNPH.EE.53 **TRACKING**

The Portfolio Holder considered a report tracking the recommendations of previous meetings.

**RESOLVED –**

- (1) That in relation to DNPH.EE.43 – Petition on Edward Street – Resident Parking Scheme. This item was pending with no further action to be taken, as of yet. There was disagreement between residents on the scheme Officers had put forward. To be kept on tracking until a conclusion has been met.**
- (2) That in relation to DNPH.EE.47 – Petition for road safety near Church of England School, Stallingborough. Discussions had taken place with multi agencies, in particular, Network Rail. Officers were confident that a solution could be put in place to solve this issue and the wider issues down Station Road, Stallingborough.**
- (3) That in relation to DNPH.ET.16 – Petition for pedestrian crossing, Station Road, Stallingborough. Officers stated that there was an option to implement a pedestrian crossing down Station Road, Stallingborough. This would link in with the parking issues down Station Road, Stallingborough.**